

CITY OF NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS
PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
purchasing@newtonma.gov
Fax (617) 796-1227

September 21, 2010

ADDENDUM #2

INVITATION FOR BID #11-10

ANNUAL – PARKING VIOLATION PROCESS & COLLECTION SERVICES

THIS ADDENDUM IS TO: **Reschedule Bid Opening Date and Answer the following Questions:**

CHANGE BID OPENING DATE TO: SEPTEMBER 30, 2010 AT 10:30 a.m.

Q1. In the City's IFB #11-10, Page 22, Part 1-Overview, Article 1.3 "Timeframe" it states... "The term of this contract shall extend from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2013. The City intends to award this contract within sixty business days."

In the "Instructions to Bidders" pg 4 Article 6.1 it states... "The City of Newton will award the contract to the lowest responsive and responsible Bidder within sixty days, Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays excluded after the opening of bids."

Section 3.14 pg 36 of Part 3-Detailed Scope of Services it states "...and the system of any accepted Contractor must be fully operational no later than October 1, 2010."

By our calculations 60 business days would fall no sooner than December 2, 2010 dependent upon City recognized holidays. In addition we feel that the time necessary for the City to properly review responses, as well as review/ negotiate contract terms would make an Oct 1st deadline impractical.

In order to properly install a new system, convert existing data, develop interfaces, perform testing, and in general meet the Bid requirements, we do not believe it reasonable for any vendor (unless they are the incumbent) to meet an October 1st operational requirement.

In light of these conflicting dates can the City make Dec 2nd 2010 the fully operational date and continue on a month to month basis with its existing vendor?

A1. In conjunction with the extension of current coverage on a monthly basis, sufficient time will be available to transfer test data.

Q2. Duncan Solutions, Inc. (Duncan) received the City of Newton's (the City) Invitation for Bid (IFB) #11-10 for Parking Violation Process and Collection Services and has thoroughly reviewed its contents and requirements. As a company that processes nearly seven million parking tickets per year for more than 200 municipalities, we welcome the opportunity participate in this procurement and to demonstrate that we are the service provider best suited to meet the City's needs. However, there is one elements of the IFB that may preclude us from doing so.

Specifically, IFB Section 1.5, Bidder Experience, states the following requirements:

- "...**three years** experience with Commonwealth of Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles in implementing the automated marking and clearing procedures for license - registration non-renewal provisions of MGL Chapter 90 Section 20 A 1/2; and

- **three years** experience with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles in performing automated name and address acquisitions...”

As the City may be aware, we have been providing violation processing and collection services to Springfield, MA for over two years and Somerville, MA for over a year. We do not have three years of experience working the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles now and obviously had less experience when those cities entrusted us to be their service provider. However, we offer innovative web-based customer service delivery and other features above and beyond those specified in the City’s IFB that were very appealing to Springfield and Somerville. Accordingly, those municipalities, decided to broaden the overly prescriptive experience-related requirements that typically appear in the IFBs and requests for procurements (RFPs) issued by municipalities in the Commonwealth.

It is interesting to note that the Town of Wellesley, MA issued an RFP for parking violation services on June 9, 2009 with comparable experience-related requirements. We submitted a formal request to Wellesley’s procurement officer to relax the prescriptive experience-related requirements so that we could participate in their procurement. The procurement officer had received seven requests for their RFP document and anticipated receiving several proposals so the requirements were not revised; however, on July 2, 2009, then Wellesley received one proposal and that was from the incumbent service provider.

Our first formal question and/or request for information regarding the IFB is provided below:

We respectfully request that the City relax by revising the aforementioned IFB language as follows:

- three years experience with departments of motor vehicles in implementing automated marking and clearing procedures for license - registration non-renewal; and
- three years experience with departments of motor vehicles in performing automated name and address acquisitions

We may have additional technical questions related to the IFB statement of work; however, if the City does not relax the experience-related requirements, it is unlikely that we will submit a bid so we do not want to burden the City by submitting those questions.

A2. Please see Addendum #1 for Answer.

Q3. How are the credit card transaction fees handled now?

A3. The City does not accept credit card fees at the window. Online credit card payments are subject to a flat fee of \$3.50.

Q4. Are the credit card fees included into current contract pricing?

A4. Any credit card fees are included in the flat fee of \$3.50, paid by the customer.

Q5. What is the Avg. ticket paid?

A5. The average dollar amount of a paid ticket is approximately \$20.00

Q6. What is current collection rate?

A6. The current annual collection rate is approximately 93% per year.

Q7. Would the City consider changing the startup date from October 1st in order to allow a new vendor ample time to implement their systems? If so, would an additional 15 days be acceptable?

A7. Please see Addendum #1 for Answer.

Q8. Can you provide a specific date as to contract award? The Bid document states within 60 days of bid due date which exceeds the October 1st, 2010 startup date requirement.

A8. Please see Addendum #1 for Answer.

Q9. Please provide manufacturer and model of existing handheld ticket writer.

A9. Casio IT3100 M56U

Q10. Will handheld ticket stock and envelopes be available for use by a new vendor if compatible with proposed handheld ticket writers? The timeline to procure customized handheld tickets and envelopes may exceed the start date of Oct 1st, 2010 based on contract award date.

A10. Ticket stock is purchased by the vendor and not available to a new vendor.

Q11. Section VIII Noncompliance and Default paragraph B refers to Contractor's Boston Office. Should the word "Boston" be deleted?

A11. Yes, "Boston" should be deleted.

Q12. Will the City arrange for test data to be turned over to the new vendor in advance of current contract termination date? The timeline to obtain data in advance to perform conversion processing, testing and acceptance is paramount to meeting an October 1st start date.

A12. In conjunction with the extension of current coverage on a monthly basis, sufficient time will be available to transfer test data.

Q13. If yes, please provide a date for receipt of files.

A13. Please see Addendum #1 for Answer.

Q14. Is the vendor responsible for the cost of handhelds; Lost by City personnel? For repairs due to neglect?

A14. Lost handhelds are City of Newton responsibility.

Q15. Page 3, Article 3, Section 3.1: This section states that proposers' submissions should be composed of the Bid form, Qualifications/References form, Resumes, and the bid guarantee. There is no mention of additional information or a narrative; however, language in the Handheld Ticket Writing Devices (HHD) section of the Detailed Scope of Services suggests that a narrative response is required. For example, on page 39, the IFB states: "Additionally, as part of the IFB submission, the vendor must clearly demonstrate and substantiate its hardware, software, existing specifications, and related equipment and service ability and capabilities to avoid a development process during the initial deployment of the HHD." Please clarify what type of submission the City is looking for – a pure bid response or a proposal submission with narrative describing the proposed system, products, and services. If proposal narrative is required, please provide further instructions regarding the format for submission.

A15. The City is seeking a pure bid response.

Q16. Page 25, Part 3.1, Violation Processing: There is no reference to a call center operation provided by the selected vendor to respond to customer telephone inquiries. Please confirm that this service is not a required.

A16. A call center is not required. However, the vendor would be expected to have the capability of directly responding to a customer inquiry regarding an issue with their processing systems.

Q17. Page 25, Part 3.1.3, Violation File Update: How many named City users will need online access to the system? Are they located in multiple facilities and, if so, how many? Do they currently have broadband Internet access?

A17. Presently there are three users in two locations. This is subject to change if Parking is reorganized. They have broadband Internet access.

Q18. Page 29, Part 3.3.1, Generally: In this section of the IFB, the City describes disposition and disputed claims functionality that would be conveyed to the selected vendor via CD, paper forms, electronic data transfer. Does City intend to have their staff use the vendor's online real-time functionality as the preferred method of supporting this Page 2 functionality? Does the paper forms requirement mean that the City wants the vendor to these key-enter paper-based decisions? Please describe the current methods for processing this information with the system now in use by the City. Please provide the data formats that currently are used for either the electronic data transfer or CD creation.

A18. The vendor's online real-time functionality would be the preferred method of supporting this functionality.

Q19. Page 34, Section 3.11, Meter Management System: Please identify which type of single-space meters are in use in Newton. If any multi-space meters are in use, please identify the manufacturer. Is a meter management system currently in use by the City? If so, please provide samples of the screen(s) most used by City staff. Also, because there is no line item for this requirement in the bid form, please provide instructions on how this offering is to be priced.

A19. All meters are POM brand Series II, model APM-E (single space) and APM-2X (two space)

The City plans to convert single space meters in municipal lots to multi-space meters over the next five years. The City advertised a request for quotes to install our first multi-space meter at the Cypress St parking lot in August 2010. The only respondents were Digital and Duncan. The City is currently in the process of determining which of these two firms is the lowest responsible bidder. We anticipate installation of the multi-space meter in Fall 2010.

While POM does provide a meter management software application, it is not currently used by DPW staff.

Q20. Pages 42 and 43, Handheld Ticket Writing Devices (HHDs): There are several references to barcodes in this section. Please specify what type of barcode (HH, 1D, 2D, or others) the City prefers. Additionally, the following IFB text makes several references to the *City's system specifications*: "The software must conform with the *City's system specifications* for the location. The software must conform with the *City's system specifications* for the Parking Enforcement Log-In-Table. The software must conform with the *City's system specifications* for the Meter Number Table." What are those specifications?

A20. Preferred 2D barcode scanning of MA inspection sticker

The traffic engineers stated that the six character alphanumeric field is sufficient for the meter number. Our current meter numbering system is a letter following by up to a 3 digit number, so 6 characters leaves us two spares for future use if needed.

Q21. Page 45, Attachment A: This attachment provides a sample of HHD ticket stock from Newport, RI. Please provide a sample of the ticket stock used by the City of Newton.

A21. Attached

Q22. Page 2 of 45, Invitation to Bid, 7th paragraph: It states "for each year of performance under this contract the successful bidder will be required to furnish a Performance Bond in the amount of 100% of the annual contract value. Can this requirement be replaced with a Corporate Parent Guarantee?

A22. Yes

Q23. The current Pay By Web model is convenience fee based whereas the constituent is charged \$3.50 per ticket transaction. If a new vendor is selected will the City continue to support a convenience fee model?

A23. Yes

Q24. Page 6 (Bid Form), 2nd letter D. Should this state "Resumes of Key Personnel (see page 22, Article 1.4)"?

A24. Yes

Q25. Page 25, Part 3 "Detailed Scope of Services" Article 3.1.1, last sentence, states "The cost for processing voids shall be stated separately as required by the attached pricing schedule."

A25. See Q26

Q26. Is the "pricing schedule" actually the Bid Form, and if so can the City please explain where this requirement is located on the Bid Form?

A26. Since it is absent from the Bid Form, this figure may be submitted via an attachment.

Q27. Page 26 Article 3.2.1. "All payments either will be received at City Hall or mailed to the contractors lockbox, as described hereafter." Does the City also want the vendor to provide violators with online payment capabilities as stated in Article 3.2.5.A?

A27. Yes

Q28. If the current vendor is selected will the City require a new hardware/handheld refresh?

A28. Yes

Q29. Does the City own the current equipment at the end of the contract or does the current vendor retain ownership?

A29. No, the City does not own the current equipment at the end of the contract.

Q30. Will the City consider a two piece Hand-held solution?

A30. No

Q31. On a scale from 1 to 10 how does the City rate the Casio Hand-held? Is the City satisfied with the devices? Any shortcomings?

A31. Regarding the handheld unit, most parking control officers rated the unit as a 7 or 8 on a 10 point scale. The most productive meter maid rated it a 10. The common complaint was that the screen is hard to read in sunlight.

Q32. Are all the technologies listed in the hand-held section currently in production or in use by the City? (OCR, bar-coding, RFID, and radio frequency transmission of data, etc)

A32. Technologies in use: Barcode reading, image capture and tickets printing a barcode which can be scanned in the office. Wireless data transfer of ticket data could be made available to the city but is not currently in use.

Q33. Of what material are the current hand-held parking tickets? Is the City using polymer paper or water resistant paper?

A33. Water resistant ticket stock, poly thermal paper.

Q34. As per Article 2.2 (page 3 of 45). In anticipation of vendor questions being submitted up until 7 calendar days prior to bid opening, and in order to allow the City enough time to respond and provide answers to vendors, can the City extend the bid opening 1 (one) week to allow proper time for vendors to evaluate and revise their bids? (Monday the 6th is also a holiday).

A34. Please see Addendum #1 for Answer.

Q35. For fiscal year 2010 how many tickets/plates were paid via the pay- by- web application?

A35. 8184

Q36. The City is requiring the awarded vendor have the new system live (with converted data) by October 1, 2010. Responses are due September 9. If a contract is awarded on September 9, the new vendor will have 16 business days to configure and convert data from Complis. The implementation timeline is a little unrealistic. Will the City considered a later go-live date?

A36. Please see Addendum #1 for Answer.

Q37. Page 34, 3.12 Equipment Supplies and Materials

a. Would the City be interested in a browser based application? (This would allow the City to access the parking citation application from Microsoft Internet Explorer 8 and not a specific workstation.)

b. If a browser based application is acceptable, is the vendor still required to provide terminals? A browser based application will allow the City to use terminals that are approved by the City and fit within the City's IT infrastructure.

c. If a browser based application is acceptable, is the vendor still required to provide printers?
There is an assumption the City can acquire printers at a lower cost with a City or State contract.

A37-a. Yes

A37-b. No

A38-c. No

Q38. Page 40, Equipment Requirements and Pricing

a. The City requests a HHD per ticket cost. The bid form on page 6, asks for a per unit price for handhelds. Can the City provide clarification on the preferred pricing model?

A38. Having both figures readily available would be beneficial to the City.

Q39. Page 45, Attachment A, Can the City confirm the layout of the ticket is what was approved? There is some confusion since the Ticket provided is from City of Newport, RI.

A39. Per Q21, a copy of a Newton ticket with the approved layout is attached.

Q40. What application does the City use today for managing permits? Would the City be interested in having one system to manage citations and permits?

A40. Current vendor has permit program on FASTTRACK software.

Q41. What application does the City use today for maintenance requests? Would the City be interested in having one system to manage citations, permits and maintenance requests?

A41. Current vendor has maintenance program.

Q42. Who is the current vendor? **Complus**

- a. What are their fees?
- b. Are any fees being passed through to the city?
- c. How long have they been providing the services?

A42-a. Any fees are included in the contractual amounts.

A42-b. All services are covered by the existing contract.

A42-c. 9 years

Q43. What is the average ticket value?

A43. See Question 5

Q44. What is the ticket value increase and what are the number of days from issuance this is added?

A44. \$10 after 21 days

\$ 5 after 60 days

\$20 RMV marking fee after 90 days

Q45. How many citations are written to out of state plates each year or month?

A45. Approximately 9,000 per year

Q46. Do you currently get owner information for all out-of-state plates?

A46. Yes

Q47. Page 23, Section 1.5, please describe the existing on-line abandoned vehicle management and on-line tow system the city has in place.

A47. Current vendor has tow program on FASTTRACK software. Talk to PD regarding abandoned vehicles.

Q48. Page 23, Section 1.6, in lieu of a performance bond would the city accept a letter of credit. It is uncommon for software vendors to supply performance bonds.

A48. Yes

Q49. How many citations are manually issued each month?

A49. Approximately 7,900

Q50. Approximately how many citations are paid online each month?

A50. 400 citations paid online monthly

Q51. How many first and second notices are sent for parking tickets each month? Please break down the number by first and second notices.

A51. Approximately 2,900 first and 1,100 second notices are sent monthly.

Q52. How many registry notifications are sent each month?

A52. 7500 RMV marks annually

Q53. How many out-of-state notification are sent each month and to which state?

A53. Over 400. All states included

Q54. How many abandoned vehicles are found each month?

A54. Approximately 8-10 per month per traffic division.

Q55. What is the city's off the windshield rate for parking tickets?

A55. The traffic division does not know.

Q56. What is the city's collection rate for each letter?

A56. City's collection rate is 93%.

Q57. What is the city's overall collection rate for parking tickets?

A57. See Q6

Q58. How many users will require access to the parking management system simultaneously at peak times? (1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 15...)

A58. Currently 2, but possibly more if Parking is reconfigured.

All other terms and conditions of this bid remain unchanged.

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THIS ADDENDUM ON YOUR BID FORM.

Thank you.



Rositha Durham
Chief Procurement Officer